

August 2003. The two declarations combined sufficiently establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of Weschler to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.

Further, Applicant does not agree with the Office Action's statement that "there is no reference to the use of commands in the Exhibit". The Exhibit clearly shows that commands are used. The Exhibit listed examples of commands such as:

"ACL: (list of n4-read attrs) (allow (read) filterattr= "readusercontrolattr")

Ex: (hobby, emergencyContact) (allow (read) filterattr= "readusercontrolattr")

ACL: ( list of n4-write attrs) (allow (write) filterattr= "writeusercontrolattr" )

Ex: (emergencyContact) (allow (write) filterattr= "writeusercontrolattr" )

where the value of a readusercontrolattr & "writeusercontrolattr" will look like

readusercontrolattr: (l(uid=sam) (uid=kelly))

writeusercontrolattr:(uid=kelly)"

The Exhibit further states:

"The ACLs are created by the DSAdmin. This way s/he has full control of what information the user can give out."

Therefore, the Exhibit references commands, contrary to the Office Action's statement.

From the above discussion, Applicant has sufficiently established diligence and that the Exhibit references the use of commands. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 37 CFR 1.131 rejection.

3. 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,332), Hann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,799,153), and Albrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,950,011).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of the declaration by the inventor, Prasanta Behera, under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 that Applicant has attached, swearing behind Weschler and in view of the declaration by the Patent Attorney, Kirk Wong, under 37 CFR 1.132 that Applicant has attached, supporting Prasanta Behera's declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131.

Additionally, Hann and Albrecht do not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 23, and 24 are in allowable condition. Claims 2-4, and 7-9, and 11-13, and 16-18, and 20-22, and 25-27 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Wong', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Kirk D. Wong,  
Reg. No. 43,284

Customer number 22862.